UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,992	01/25/2002	Laurent Frerebeau	T3264-907643	8715

181   7590   11/04/2004

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER
HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/031,992	FREREBEAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 March 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>14-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>14-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>18</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 January 2002</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

         1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1.25.02</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Supplemental Preliminary

Amendment filed on 3/20/03.

2.   Claims 14 – 28 are pending in the case. Claims 14, 23, 24, 27, and 28 are

independent.

Priority

3.   Applicant is advised of possible benefits under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), wherein an

application for patent filed in the United States may be entitled to the benefit of the filing

date of a prior application filed in a foreign country.

4.   Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which

papers have been placed of record in the file.

5.   Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a translation of the foreign

application should be submitted under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.

Drawings

6.   The drawings are objected to because the unlabeled rectangular box(es) shown

in the drawings should be provided with descriptive text labels. Corrected drawing

sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to

avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should

include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if

only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the

appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

7.   Claim 18 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 15 is a Markush claim; therefore, it is only necessary to follow one path as set forth in that claim. The path limited by claim 18 may or may not be followed; thus, claim 18 does not fully further limit the claim from which it depends. Consequently, no further action on the merits with respect to claim 18 will be taken by the Office at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

10.   Regarding dependent claim 20, it is unclear how a tag in a markup document is

in a format, which does not correspond to a markup language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 14 – 17, 19 – 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over CompuServe (WO97/18516) [as cited by Applicant].

13.   **Regarding independent claim 14**, CompuServe teaches that *translation of Web*

pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server configuration,

requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and display

information. Preferably, the HTML codes are identified prior to translation, then

surrounded by special boundary markers to block the translation process on the codes.

The HTML preprocessor uses its knowledge regarding the markups, codes, data

characters and the structure of HTML documents to determine which codes should be

blocked from the translation process. After translation is complete, a postprocessing

program removes the special boundary markers so that the necessary references,

commands, and display characteristics are available in the translated text (page 9, line

18 – page 10, line 2), which provide for **detecting a localization tag** (HTML codes) **in the document; retrieving, from the document, localization information** (reference) **associated with said localization tag; and replacing said localization tag in the document with the localized value** (translation) **found in the translation file**. CompuServe does not explicitly teach **searching...** However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of CompuServe in order to provide for **searching a translation file for a localized value associated with the localization information**, since CompuServe does disclose that *optionally, the user may be able to update and edit parts of the MT software's electronic dictionaries to include terminology common to the Web sites he visits* (page 8, lines 19 – 20).

14.   **Regarding dependent claim 15**, CompuServe teaches that *translation of Web pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server configuration, requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and display information* (page 9, lines 18 – 20), which provides that **said localization information includes at least one of a localization attribute, a default localization value, and a value corresponding to an automatic transcription function**.

15.   **Regarding dependent claims 16 and 17**, CompuServe teaches that *translation of Web pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server configuration, requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and display information* (page 9, lines 18 – 20), which provides for **detecting said localization tag based on the type of document identified in said identifying step; and recognizing at least one of grammar and syntax used in the document based**

on the type of document identified in said identifying step. CompuServe does not

explicitly teach **identifying**. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to modify and/or use the invention

of CompuServe to provide for **identifying a type of the document**, since the invention

processes HTML codes and may not work on other web pages that utilize another

markup language, the skilled artisan wants to insure the invention processes HTML.

16.   **Regarding dependent claim 19**, CompuServe teaches that *the HTML codes are*

identified prior to translation (page 9, line 20), which provides that **said tag is a markup**

language tag.

17.   **Regarding dependent claim 20**, CompuServe teaches that *after translation is*

complete, a postprocessing program removes the special boundary markers so that the

necessary references, commands, and display characteristics are available in the

translated text (page 9, line 24 – page 10, line 2), which provide that **said tag is in a**

format which does not correspond to a markup language.

18.   **Regarding dependent claim 21**, CompuServe does not explicitly teach **creating**

the translation file. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to modify the teachings of CompuServe in order to provide for **creating the**

translation file to include information which associates said localization

information with said localized value, since CompuServe does disclose that *the user*

may be able to update and edit parts of the MT software's electronic dictionaries to

include terminology common to the Web sites he visits (page 8, lines 19 – 20).

19.   **Regarding dependent claim 22**, CompuServe teaches that *translation of Web*

pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server configuration,

requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and display

information. Preferably, the HTML codes are identified prior to translation, then

surrounded by special boundary markers to block the translation process on the codes.

The HTML preprocessor uses its knowledge regarding the markups, codes, data

characters and the structure of HTML documents to determine which codes should be

blocked from the translation process. After translation is complete, a postprocessing

program removes the special boundary markers so that the necessary references,

commands, and display characteristics are available in the translated text (page 9, line

18 – page 10, line 2), which provide for **loading code used to implement said**

localization tool into the document, said code dynamically generating additional

code; and performing said replacing step as said additional code is dynamically

generated by said code used to implement said localization tool.

20.   **Regarding independent claim 23**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

21.   **Regarding independent claim 24**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

22.   **Regarding dependent claim 25**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 22, and is rejected along the same rationale.

23.   **Regarding independent claim 27**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

24.   **Regarding independent claim 28**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

25.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CompuServe (WO97/18516) [cited by Applicant] as applied to claims 14 – 17, 19 – 25, 27 and 28 above, and further in view of Jeske (US005974443A) [as cited by Applicant].

26.   **Regarding dependent claim 26**, CompuServe does not explicitly teach **CGI**. However, Jeske teaches that *the preferred embodiment is to use CGI 111, which is an industry standard method of communicating between a web server and another program. HTTPd 103 initiates the CGIG process (common gateway interface gateway) 104, which is a program component that provides access to the agent platform 105. Note that more than one CGIG 104 can be running on the web server 102, with one CGIG per concurrent browser request* (Column 3, lines 15 – 22), which provide that **the localization tool is a CGI component**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of CompuServe with that of Jeske because such a combination would allow the users of CompuServe the benefit of an *access tool that allows for dynamic information generation for web servers* (Column 2, lines 54 – 55).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

NH